

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending. In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because Figure 1 should be designated by a legend; the specification was objected to because of certain informalities; claims 1-5, 11-15, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a) and 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Tomita (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0105922); and claims 6-10 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomita in view of Dekoning (U.S. Patent No. 6,148,368).

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to Figure 1. Although Figure 1 illustrates a RAID-5 data storage system, the RAID-5 data storage system of Figure 1 includes operational aspects that are not prior art for detecting and correcting corrupt data. For example, paragraph 22 of the specification states "...disks 16(1)-16(5) will be described as storing one data volume (data volume V), it being understood that the present invention should not be limited thereto. In addition to storing data volume V, disks 16(1)-16(5) store first error correction data. Disk drive 16(6) stores second error correction data" Also, paragraph 25 discloses further information concerning disk 16(6) when it states that "Each stripe S_y has a corresponding entry of second error correction data stored in disk drive 16(6)." Thus, the RAID-5 data storage system of Figure 1 should not be labeled prior art and the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to Figure 1.

Regarding the objections to the specification, Applicants express regret for the numerous formal and typographical errors in the specification. The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's efforts in identifying some of these errors, and have made every effort to correct all of these

errors. Specifically, Applicants have amended paragraphs 11, 24, 25, and 30 of the specification to correct the inadvertent typographical errors that the Examiner suggested be changed. In addition, Applicants have amended the title according to the Examiner's suggestion to clarify the invention set out in the claims. No new matter is introduced by any of these amendments.

Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a) and 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) rejections of claims 1-5, 11-15, 21, and 22 as being anticipated by Tomita.

Tomita paragraph 102 fails to teach or disclose returning data of the first stripe unit to the computer system much less returning data of the first stripe unit to the computer system if the first parity data compares equally to the new first parity data as recited in independent claim 1 and generally in independent claims 11, 21, and 22. Tomita paragraph 102 discloses the controller 1 determining whether parity data is successfully written, not whether data of the first stripe unit is returned to the computer system. For at least this reason, Applicants urge the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a) and 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) rejections of independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 22, and Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. As dependent claims 2-5 and 12-15 add limitations to allowable base claims, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a) and 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) rejections to these claims as being anticipated by Tomita.

Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 6-10 and 16-20 as being unpatentable over Tomita in view of Dekoning.

For at least the reason that dependent claims 6-10 and 16-20 add further limitations to already allowable base claims, Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 6-10 and 16-20.

CONCLUSION

Applicant(s) submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450, on September 28, 2005.

Russell C. Scott 9/28/05
Attorney for Applicant(s) Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Russell C. Scott

Russell C. Scott
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 43,103
Telephone: (512) 439-5089
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099